

**CMER**  
**November 21, 2002**  
**NWIFC Conference Center**  
**DRAFT Minutes**

---

Attendees:

Carlson, Margen	DNR
Clark, Jeffrey	Weyerhaeuser
Cramer, Darin	DNR, Federal Assurances
Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
Ehinger, Bill	DOE
Fransen, Brian	Weyerhaeuser
Glass, Domoni	Consultant
Green, Matthew	DOE
Grizzel, Jeff	DNR, Federal Assurances Program
Heide, Pete	WFPA
Hunter, Mark	WDFW
Jackson, Terry	WDFW
Keller, Steve	NOAA Fisheries
Lippke, Bruce	University of Washington
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre
Martin, Doug	CMER Co-chair
McConnell, Steve	NWIFC
McFadden, George	NWIFC
McNaughton, Geoff	DNR
Pederson, Pete	United Columbia Upper Tribes
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Poon, Derek	EPA
Price, Dave	WDFW
Pucci, Dawn	Suquamish Tribe
Quinn, Tim	WDFW
Risenhoover, Ken	Port Blakely
Rowe, Blake	Longview Fibre
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR

---

October minutes were approved as amended.

---

**Summary of Assignments and Consensus**

<b>Budget</b>	Sturhan will check into whether and how DIF funds can be
---------------	--

	reallocated.
<b>SAG Requests</b>	CMER reached consensus and approved the ISAG request for an open forum to discuss the fish model.
<b>SAG Requests</b>	<p>McNaughton will check to see where DNR is in their approval process and will seek an answer from the attorney general's office regarding CMER research exemptions.</p> <p>Quinn and Martin will raise this issue during the 12/5 FFR Policy committee meeting.</p> <p>CMER representatives will communicate with their policy representatives so that everyone is prepared for discussion at the 12/5 policy meeting.</p>
<b>Handbook Committee</b>	Sturhan will contact individual SAGs to see who has dedicated time to CMER and who volunteers.
<b>Handbook Committee</b>	The Handbook committee will have a facilitation proposal ready for CMER consideration for the January meeting.
<b>SAG Issues</b>	RSAG will prepare a recommendation on the \$200,000 budget for DFC for the December prioritization workshop.
<b>SAG Issues</b>	UPSAG will have a draft report on the PIP pilot to CMER in December and a meeting for CMER to discuss and make decisions will be scheduled for early January.
<b>CMER Meetings</b>	<p>The January CMER meeting is being moved to January 23<sup>rd</sup>.</p> <p>Martin will forward an agenda for the headwaters workshop as soon as he receives it.</p>
<b>Prioritization Process</b>	<p>Step 1 – complete by 11/25: remove all projects that are related to status and trend monitoring, and intensive monitoring. Remove all bull trout studies. Add the existing projects. Remove Rule tool projects as they do not need any further CMER prioritization. SAGs forward their changes to Palmquist by Monday (11/25).</p> <p>Step 2 – complete by 11/27: Schuett-Hames and Palmquist forward instructions, the list of projects, and the draft workplan to CMER who then proceeds to rank all remaining projects according to the criteria presented in Chapter 9 of the workplan (Palmquist criteria) Doug and Tim will check over products before delivery to CMER.</p> <p>Step 3 – Complete by 12/12: CMER rankings are completed and returned to Schuett-Hames for compilation.</p> <p>Step 4 – complete by 12/17: Schuett-Hames forwards compiled list to CMER participants for review prior to 12/19 meeting.</p> <p>Step 5 – December 19 prioritization works</p>

---

**Budget:** A new budget sheet was distributed. Bull Trout has been removed and will appear on a second page so that it is clear that the money funding these projects is from a different source. This movement of the bull trout funding will also show that these projects are not part of the prioritization process. This budget sheet is also arranged in categories (i.e. rule tools, effectiveness monitoring, cumulative effects). The program, through 2005, is around \$14 million. There is currently \$1.501 million in unallocated funds. A note to remember: June 30, 2003 is the deadline for spending 02 monies.

There are three items under rule tools that need policy discussion before they can be carried forward (DFC target validation, landslide hazard zonation, perennial stream survey projects [PIP]).

The DIF (Direct Implementation Fund) monies on the budget sheet are through DOE and are allocated to the RMAP effectiveness project. There was discussion regarding the allocation of these funds and whether they could be devoted to another purpose to free up other CMER monies.

**Assignment:** Sturhan will check into whether and how DIF funds can be reallocated.

---

### **SAG Requests:**

ISAG: Review of the westside validation study. ISAG is requesting, relative to the fish model, that CMER vary from the standard review process and allow an open forum instead. Following the open forum, anonymous comments would be requested on the report. This is a complex issue, and an open forum to ensure understanding of the issue prior to commenting is important. Quinn suggested that the group participating in this forum should also review the validation model. Secondly, the statistics group wants to take more time to analyze the model so this review process may be delayed until March. ISAG will request SRC review toward the end of March on this project. Quinn asked about the field season for next summer and Fransen indicated that they should be able to use that field season. The actual model will be available at the end of January; the report will be what takes the time. Martin expressed concern about DNR moving toward implementation without a reviewed and agreed to report. Cramer indicated that DNR will not move to implementation until the peer review has been completed.

**Consensus: CMER approved the ISAG request for an open forum to discuss the fish model.**

RSAG: Rowe said that RSAG is pursuing a research exemption for CMER projects so that they do not have to go through individual FPAs on each site for the hardwood conversions study. McNaughton has presented this issue to DNR.. There is concern about proposing an exemption from the rules. If there is no rule exemption, participants in the study will be forced through the alternate planning process to get prescriptions approved.

The alternate planning process can be long and cumbersome and it will cut down on the availability of sites for the study. Dieu suggested a blanket FPA that would go through SEPA once. If the description is detailed enough, this would work. Keller said that alternate plans are intended to meet the intent of the rule and some of these research sites will not meet this threshold. Jackson said that the hardwood conversion study is an open process without a lot of criteria. Rowe said that RSAG has discussed getting recognition at a broad level that CMER projects qualify for the exemption. Each project would be considered differently by DNR.

**Action:** McNaughton will check to see where DNR is in their approval process and will seek an answer from the attorney general's office. Quinn and Martin will raise this issue during the 12/5 FFR Policy committee meeting. CMER representatives will communicate with their policy representatives so that everyone is prepared for discussion at the 12/5 policy meeting.

---

**SRC Update:** The contract is still on hold pending resolution of data ownership and policy issues. Young, McElroy and McNaughton are going up to UW to discuss this further.

---

**CMER Handbook Committee:** Pleus said that the committee met with the CMER co-chairs, McNaughton and Smitch yesterday to discuss progress and issues. The handbook continues to develop and the committee will bring forward items for CMER discussion and work following the prioritization process. Several chapters of the handbook deal with the organizational structure of CMER and others deal with tools to use as projects develop. Tools are the highest priority at this time. The committee agreed that a facilitator would be helpful during this process to educate CMER on how to run meetings and help us be fitted to the task.

Also, Sturhan will be contacting the chairs of SAGs to see how many people have time dedicated to work on CMER, as opposed to those that volunteer. If we determine that we need more dedicated support for this process, we can go to policy and request that help if we can clearly demonstrate the need.

Pleus said that the committee is trying to help this process out to make it more efficient and effective. Documenting this process so that we can continue in an efficient and constructive way is important. Clark asked if we are requesting that CMER spend money for a facilitator at this time. Pleus said that there is no formal proposal at this time but a proposal will be ready for the next CMER meeting. Martin said that we do have a facilitator at this time to help us move through issues.

---

**CMER/Policy Interaction Meeting (11/6):** a summary of policy recommendations was distributed to participants. Quinn reviewed all recommendations with the group to ensure common understanding. Policy is supportive of the CMER prioritization process. There is

a huge budget shortfall expected this year and we must have a workplan to ensure funding. The policy committee was prepared to meet next month and prioritize for CMER but CMER has requested some time to get through the internal process and then will approach policy.

Quinn suggested that the stakeholder committee needs to be meeting on a regular basis to deal with issues being surfaced in CMER. Their job is to help policy understand these issues surfacing in CMER. Pleus suggested that there is no standing stakeholder committee and Grizzel agreed. The stakeholders are pulled together to develop things such as rules and federal assurances. It was also suggested that McNaughton would be the one to call together stakeholders regarding CMER issues. McNaughton said he has not called together the stakeholders because the issues are not ready. Jackson understood that the stakeholders would be responsible for understanding management implications of CMER projects and explaining that to policy. Price suggested regular communication between the stakeholders. Pleus said that, as a member of the stakeholders, he wants to be careful not to appear autonomous.

---

**Workplan Next Steps:** Martin said that the workplan is moving along. Prioritization is the next issue that we need to tackle and no further work on the workplan should be done until we have prioritized. Program level versus project level planning is an issue. Program planning is the better way to proceed. Quinn added that Smitch believes that policy should be approached on a programmatic level, not a project level.

---

## **SAG Issues**

DFC: Rowe said that two parts of the DFC results have been analyzed and there are several parts left to be analyzed. RSAG is planning to review a draft report in December with the goal of having a product to CMER in January. This may all be moved back one month if the work cannot be completed. Quinn asked about the \$200,000 allocated for next year. This is a decision point for policy and if there is a field season associated with this money. Schuett-Hames said that amount was left in, in case they needed additional samples and a decision will now be needed to determine whether RSAG needs this money. If the DFC analysis leads them to another question, the study will not be developed until at least the 04 biennium. Therefore, they will likely not need the money next year.

**Action: RSAG will prepare a recommendation on the \$200,000 for the December prioritization workshop.**

PIP: Quinn said that this is another group that has budgeted dollars for next year that may or may not be used and policy guidance on PIPs is needed. We need to resolve these issues if we can and then it would go to policy. Glass said that to do anything in 03 will be difficult if not impossible so it is unlikely that UPSAG will use the dollars. UPSAG indicated that they could present something to CMER in December. Martin suggested

that CMER may need a separate meeting for this presentation and he asked that CMER get the report at least one week prior to any CMER discussion.

**Action: UPSAG will have a draft report to CMER in December and a meeting for CMER to discuss and make decisions will be scheduled for early in January.**

WETSAG: This group is now sorting through video from the wetlands workshop and the synthesis project will be proposed in December with final proceedings from the workshop drafted by early February. McNaughton added that WETSAG is reversing their earlier recommendation for peer review as a result of the workshop. WETSAG is now asking that the paper go through CMER peer review. Martin said that if WETSAG wants SRC review they need to formally propose this. Parks is still seeking a co-chair for WETSAG.

Bull Trout Site Selection Status: Jackson said that BTSAG had a well attended and productive meeting last week. Cupp and McFadden updated the committee on sites. Cupp was encouraging and had a large list of potential sites so BTSAG will find at least 15 and maybe more. There were a few issues that need to be resolved to provide guidance for site selection. A concern for using Type N streams as BT sites was brought up; type N streams are not representative of fish habitat and if we use those sites, it removes them from the Type N effectiveness monitoring study. Most of the group felt that if these streams meet the criteria of the emergency rule, they should be okay as fish habitat streams. This study is looking at temperature response. Jackson is requesting guidance on the type N issue. Schuett-Hames said that if streams meet the emergency rule criteria for fishbearing, then they are type F streams. BTSAG will have a list of potential sites in January. Jackson said that Scott Craig had an assignment to see about using sites on HCP lands. The issue with using HCP sites is that if they use those sites, mitigation will be necessary for any habitat loss; Jackson will update this group when these discussions have occurred.

RSAG: RSAG is planning to forward the Type N and F effectiveness study in December. They will propose to discuss this in January. There is a potential that this study can move forward to fiscal year 03.

ISAG: The field validation study will be ready for CMER review soon and they will request quick turn around. CMER requested a presentation when the stopping rule development was complete and they will be ready to present in January. There is \$200,000 budgeted for fish passage and this project is still in the stakeholder process for resolution of issues with the project. If the issue is not resolved quickly, ISAG will not need these dollars.

---

**Schedule**: January 16<sup>th</sup> is the first scheduled CMER meeting of 2003. There is a headwaters workshop in Oregon that day that CMER participants would be interested in attending. Therefore, CMER recommends that the January CMER meeting be moved to

January 23<sup>rd</sup>. Martin will forward the agenda for the headwaters workshop as soon as he gets it.

---

The meeting adjourned at 11:04 a.m.

---

### **PM Session – Prioritization**

CMER participants heard a presentation from Bob Palmquist regarding the prioritization process that the Pavel prioritization group has been working on. There was much discussion regarding this process (comments have been forwarded to Pavel for the prioritization group's consideration). The group felt that this process has merit and should be refined and presented to CMER as a finished product that we can all understand prior to using this process for prioritization. In the interest of time, we will use the prioritization process that was presented in the workplan (chapter 9) to prioritize effectiveness projects on December 19<sup>th</sup>.

To provide background, the budget sheet has been arranged into the following categories: program administration costs, rule tool projects, status and trend monitoring, effectiveness monitoring (current BMPs), effectiveness monitoring (alternative management treatments) and cumulative effects/fish response/intensive monitoring. Program administration costs and rule tool projects are considered top priorities and will not need any further prioritization by CMER at this time. There are policy questions relating to the rule tool projects. There are two status and trend monitoring projects in the MDT report (N/F effectiveness and fish passage effectiveness) that are ready for Policy review. CMER prioritization is unnecessary at this time Effectiveness monitoring (current BMPs); this category contains most current CMER projects and this is where prioritization efforts will be focused. Effectiveness monitoring (alternative management treatments); projects in this category will largely be recommended by policy so any prioritization questions in this category will be addressed by them. There are no projects in the cumulative effects program at this time, so no prioritization in this category will be necessary.

The steps to complete prioritization are as follows:

Step 1 – complete by 11/25: remove all projects that are related to status and trend monitoring, and intensive monitoring. Remove all bull trout studies. Add the existing projects. Remove Rule tool projects as they do not need any further CMER prioritization. SAGs forward their changes to Palmquist by Monday (11/25).

Step 2 – complete by 11/27: Schuett-Hames and Palmquist (per Doug and Tim review) forward instructions, the list of projects, and the draft workplan to CMER who then proceeds to rank all remaining projects according to the criteria presented in Chapter 9 of the workplan (Palmquist criteria)

Step 3 – Complete by 12/12: CMER rankings are completed and returned to Schuett-Hames for compilation.

Step 4 – complete by 12/17: Schuett-Hames forwards compiled list to CMER participants for review prior to 12/19 meeting.

Step 5 – December 19 prioritization workshop

The prioritization workshop results will then be forwarded to the FFR Policy committee for further refinement. They will meet sometime during the last two weeks of January.